

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/892,242	QI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Ponnoreay Pich	2135

All Participants:

Status of Application: Final Rejection

(1) Ponnoreay Pich.

(3) _____.

(2) Lori Gordon.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 8/15/06

Time: 11 AM

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112, second paragraph rejections of claims 3, 25, and 39-40

Claims discussed:

3, 25, and 39-40

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that in discussing the claims with two primary examiners as well as having considered what the prior art teaches, it appears that because claims 3, 25, and 39-40 state that the cryptography engine in the independent claims is a DES engine, the claims are indefinite since DES is a recognized standard while the engine defined by applicant in the independent claims is instead an improvement upon a standard. An improved engine cannot be also called the standard engine. The examiner recommended cancelling claims 3, 25, and 39-40 to expedite allowance of the application. Ms. Gordon disagrees with the 112, second paragraph rejections and believes that the engine define in the independent claims is also a DES engine. Due to no agreement being reached, the examiner stated that the examiner will mail out a final office action with the rejection of claims 3, 25, and 39-40..